

Remarks

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 7, 2010. Claims 6 to 9 remain in this application. Claims 6 and 9 are the independent Claims. Claims 6 to 9 have been amended. Claims 1 to 5 have been cancelled, without prejudice. It is believed that no matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein.

Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are now respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 6 to 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,203,913 (Shimose).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that the claims herein are patentable in light of the clarifying amendments above and the arguments below.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

The present application is generally directed to a heat resistant flexible laminate.

Claim 6:

As defined by amended independent Claim 6, a method for manufacturing a heat resistant flexible laminate comprises a step of laminating a heat resistant adhesive material and a metal foil by thermal lamination in a temperature range of not less than 200 degrees C. A film-like protective material is disposed on the outside of the metallic foil between a pressurized surface and the metallic foil at the time of thermal lamination. Coefficients of linear expansion of the heat resistant adhesive material and the protective material in a temperature range of 200

Appl. No. 10/532,766
Amdt. Dated November 9, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action of July 7, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 1001.102
Customer No.: 95674

degrees C to 300 degrees C are within a range of $\bullet o \pm 10$ ppm/degree C are provided. A coefficient of linear expansion of the metallic foil is defined as $\bullet o$. The metallic foil is a rolled copper foil or an electrolytic copper foil.

The applied references fail to disclose or even suggest the above features of amended independent Claim 6 of the present invention. In particular, the applied references fail to disclose, teach or suggest "wherein a film-like protective material is disposed on the outside of the metallic foil between a pressurized surface and the metallic foil at the time of thermal lamination," as required by amended independent Claim 6 of the present invention.

According to the Office Action, the product claim resulting from the method of amended independent Claim 6 is unpatentable over a prior art product obtained by any other method. (*See, Office Action, P. 2-4*). However, the Office Action concedes that the above limitation of amended independent Claim 6 is not taught or suggested by the applied Shimose reference. (*See, Office Action, P. 3*).

In accordance with the Office Action, Applicants have amended independent Claim 6 to overcome the above rejection.

Claim 9:

As defined by amended independent Claim 9, a method for manufacturing a heat resistant flexible laminate comprises a step of laminating a heat resistant adhesive material and a metallic foil by thermal lamination in a temperature range of not less than 200 degrees C. A reusable film-like protective material is detachably secured to the outside of the metallic foil between a pressurized surface and the metallic foil at the time of thermal lamination, such that the protective material can be removed after lamination and re-used. Coefficients of linear expansion of the heat resistant adhesive material and the protective material in a temperature range of 200 degrees C to 300 degrees C are within a range of $\bullet o \pm 10$

Appl. No. 10/532,766
Amdt. Dated November 9, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action of July 7, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 1001.102
Customer No.: 95674

ppm/degree C. A coefficient of linear expansion of the metallic foil is defined as •o. The metallic foil is a rolled copper foil or an electrolytic copper foil.

The applied references fail to disclose or even suggest the above features of amended independent Claim 9 of the present invention. In particular, the applied references fail to disclose, teach or suggest “wherein a reusable film-like protective material is detachably secured to the outside of the metallic foil between a pressurized surface and the metallic foil at the time of thermal lamination,” as required by amended independent Claim 9 of the present invention.

Moreover, the applied reference fails to disclose, teach or even suggest “such that the protective material can be removed after lamination and re-used,” as required by amended independent Claim 9 of the present invention.

According to the Office Action, the product claim resulting from the method of amended independent Claim is unpatentable over a prior art product obtained by any method. (*See, Office Action, P. 2-4*). However, the Office Action concedes that the above limitations of amended independent Claim 9 are not taught or suggested by Shimose. (*See, Office Action, P. 3.*).

In response, Applicants have amended independent Claim 9 to overcome the rejections.

Accordingly, the applied Shimose reference does not disclose, teach or even suggest the above features of amended independent Claims 6 and 9 of the present invention.

Since the cited reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above features recited in amended independent Claims 6 and 9, these references cannot be said to anticipate nor render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of those claims.

Appl. No. 10/532,766
Amdt. Dated November 9, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action of July 7, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 1001.102
Customer No.: 95674

Accordingly, amended independent Claims 6 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend from amended independent Claim 6 and recite additional features of the invention which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. For example, amended dependent Claim 7 recites “wherein a percentage of dimensional change between before and after removal of at least a portion of the metallic foil by etching is in a range of $\pm 0.05\%$.” Applicants respectfully suggest that this feature is neither taught nor suggested by Shimose and further distinguishes this claim from the applied reference.

Appl. No. 10/532,766
Amdt. Dated November 9, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action of July 7, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 1001.102
Customer No.: 95674

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 223-2365 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-5225.

Respectfully submitted,
ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

Date: November 9, 2010

By: /Dariush G. Adli/
Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)

633 West Fifth Street, Suite 2600
Los Angeles, California 90041
Phone: 213-223-2365
Fax: 213-223-2368
Email: ip@adlilaw.com